

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-59 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 8, and 38 being the independent claims. Previously withdrawn claims 14-37 and 47-59 are amended to depend from currently pending claims.

Applicants have amended the independent claims above to now even more clearly demonstrate how Applicants' claimed invention is distinguished from the applied reference. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and are designed to now even more clearly claim the invention. Entry of the amendments is respectfully requested.

Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Examiner Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephonic interview of January 10, 2006. Applicants explained the nature and background of the invention, and discussed the applied reference in the context of claim 1. It was agreed that the applied reference does not teach the invention, and that some amendment is needed to clarify the nature of the "lifecycle policies" recited in the claims.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Action on pages 3-5, section 4, claims 1-13 and 38-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,266,679 to Szalwinski et al (hereinafter "Szalwinski"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 recites a computer-implemented method of managing a file lifecycle, ***a file lifecycle comprising at least two stages including file building, file reference, file non-use, and/or file archiving***, the method comprising the steps of storing data on a storage medium comprising: storing said file on said storage medium accessible by a computer, ***said file having associated therewith a set of lifecycle policies relating to file storage locations*** within said storage medium; automatically determining from the associated lifecycle policies when said file is to be moved; and, moving said file to another storage location within said storage medium or

within a different storage medium when said file is to be moved. (Emphasis added). Szalwinski fails to teach or suggest at least one element of claim 1.

The Action asserts that Szalwinski teaches or discloses **a set of lifecycle policies relating to file storage locations within said storage medium**. This is incorrect. Szalwinski does not teach or disclose file **lifecycle** policies relating to file storage locations. Instead, Szalwinski teaches a method of **archiving** and retrieving data using a database to store file location information. See, e.g., Szalwinski Abstract. Szalwinski refers only to archiving policies, but makes no reference to **lifecycle** policies. In contrast, a file lifecycle, as used and claimed, includes at least two stages, where the stages include file building, file reference, file non-use, and/or file archiving. See specification, page 1, lines 7-9. Some examples of file lifecycles and file lifecycle policies that relate to the file storage locations are illustrated in the specification, for example, beginning at page 7, line 23 through page 10. Therefore, Szalwinski fails to teach at least one element of claim 1. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and claim 1 be allowed.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least for being dependent on an allowable claim.

Claims 8 and 38, as amended, recite a similar element as claim 1, and are allowable for at least the reasons given above for claim 1.

Further, claims 14-37 and 47-59 now depend from claim 1, and are allowable for at least the reasons given above for claim 1.

Claims 9-13 and 39-46 depend from claims 8 and 38, respectively, and are allowable at least for being dependent on an allowable claim.

In the Action on pages 5-6, sections 20-21, claims 1-13 and 38-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,438,642 to Shaath et al pending the filing of a supplemental oath indicating the continuation status of the present application. Such supplemental oath has been filed, rendering the rejection moot.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Dated: March 7, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Caroline J. Swindell

Registration No.: 56,784

Ralph P. Albrecht

Registration No.: 43,466

VENABLE LLP

P.O. Box 34385

Washington, DC 20043-9998

(202) 344-4000

(202) 344-8300 (Fax)

Attorney/Agent For Applicant